

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

12 August 2021

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Valladares, Susan (2018) '“All the world's a stage all the men are merely players”: Theatre-going in London during the Hundred Days', in Napoleon's 100 Days and the Struggle for Legitimacy. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 185-208. War, Culture and Society, 1750-1850.

Further information on publisher's website:

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70208-7_10

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of a chapter published in Napoleon's 100 Days and the Struggle for Legitimacy. The final authenticated version is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70208-7_10

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

**‘All the world’s a stage & all the men are merely players’: Theatre-going in London
during the Hundred Days**

What did the Duke of Wellington, General Gebhard von Blücher, and the actor Edmund Kean have in common? Enough, William Heath would argue, to warrant their selection for his graphic satire, *Three great actors all the world a Stage & all the men are mearly [sic] Players*. First published by Samuel Knight on 19 May 1814, Heath’s print aligns the still remarkable news of Napoleon’s first abdication (6 April 1814) with the dizzying heights of success enjoyed by Edmund Kean, who had made his London debut in January of that year. At the left of the print is Wellington, who points with one hand, as if issuing a command, while the other hand grasps the hilt of his sword; Blücher is at the centre; and Kean to the right. Wellington and Blücher both wear full military dress. But whereas Wellington strikes an elegant figure, Blücher is obviously caricatured: his hat removed, the Prussian Field Master stands with his legs wide apart and places both hands on his hips. His physiognomy reveals furled eyebrows and such a bad squint that both his eyes turn outwards. This gives the impression that Blücher keeps one eye firmly on Wellington, while the other focuses on Kean. Meanwhile, Kean appears in elaborate stage costume as Richard III, donning the velvet cloak and ermine hat that would long be associated with his interpretation of Shakespeare’s Machiavellian king. Already in character, Kean’s hunched back is turned away from the two military men, while still allowing him to make eye contact with the print’s viewers. The fact that the positioning of Kean’s hands almost perfectly resembles that of Wellington suggests that Kean was to the theatres of London what Wellington was to the European theatres of war, while Blücher’s centrality acknowledges his instrumental role in securing the surrender of the French armies.

Heath's decision to depict Kean as Richard III was no doubt determined, first and foremost, by the actor's success in that role (chosen for his first season at Drury Lane in full awareness of its important contribution to David Garrick's celebrity in the 1740s).¹ But Heath may also have been influenced by a more recent graphic satire of 1808, the anonymous *Patriotic Vision appearing to N. Buonaparte*, which offers a politicized re-imagining of Hogarth's 1745 portrait of David Garrick as the haunted Richard III that substitutes Napoleon for the preeminent Shakespearean actor.² As David Francis Taylor has argued, graphic satirists seem to have been loath to invest the French leader with 'the cultural authority and national prestige' associated with William Shakespeare, making this particular print an especially interesting example of the appropriation of Shakespeare to political ends.³ The resulting invitation to think of Kean as a second Napoleon would be only further intensified during the course of the Hundred Days, with prints such as Heath's *A Lecture on Heads Delivered by Marshalls Wellington & Blucher* (1815) and Thomas Rowlandson's *Transparency of the Victory at Waterloo* (1815) both coupling Wellington and Blücher as Napoleon's successful captors.⁴

[Insert Fig.1 here.]

Fig. 1: William Heath, *Three great actors all the world a Stage & all the men are nearly [sic] Players*, published by S. Knight (19 May 1814). Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, [DSO-7461-22571]

The graphic satires produced during the Hundred Days provide fascinating insight into popular responses to Napoleon's escape from Elba, his return to Paris and eventual defeat by allied forces, as explored in more detail by John Moores in Chapter XXX. An awareness of visual culture also informs the argument of this essay but only to the extent that

contemporary theatre-going might be best understood as a multimedia experience that called upon various levels of visual, musical and verbal literacies. The early nineteenth-century theatre offered an affordable and popular pastime within the reach of a broad social spectrum. It was, furthermore, a form of entertainment that had been significantly bolstered by the war against France. Charles Dibdin the Younger, manager of Sadler's Wells Theatre, thus wrote:

As far as my experience goes, Theatres (in London, at least) prosper most during War, and it is a fact, that immediately previous to the short Peace of Amiens, Sadler's Wells was crowded every night; but as soon as the Peace was announced, our receipts suddenly fell off to a very serious degree, and continued in that reduced state, till the war recommenced, and then they recovered their former amount.⁵

But during the Hundred Days theatre tickets continued to sell out, not least because Napoleon's return to France coincided with the height of an especially exciting theatrical season, which saw new actors such as Edmund Kean, Charles Mayne Young and Eliza O'Neill secure their 'star' status by taking on ever more ambitious roles. Melodramas also continued to enjoy widespread success; the spectacular 'blow-ups' which constituted such a critical part of the melodramatic dramaturgy rendering this genre of entertainment particularly popular at the time of Napoleon's return to France. As Jane Moody explains, the 'blow-up' provided a highly symbolic 'form of patriotic retribution, an act of dramatic vengeance upon history'.⁶ For a nation at war, Britain's theatrical and political histories were closely linked – and, in many cases, inextricably, and deliberately, so – as exemplified by Heath's pointed decision to place Kean alongside Wellington and Blücher.

This essay seeks to locate the Hundred Days within English popular culture by offering an examination of the entertainments then on offer at the patent theatres of Covent Garden and Drury Lane. As sites closely monitored by the Office of the Lord Chamberlain, the history of the patent stages testifies powerfully to the overlap between political and

cultural discourses. These were, after all, venues wherein popular reactions were kept in check by the state, but rarely straightforwardly, and often uneasily.⁷ To what extent, then, did the repertoires at Covent Garden and Drury Lane engage with Napoleon's return to power? Were questions of political order, security and legitimacy acknowledged and addressed? How effective was political censorship of the theatres? And why might Edmund Kean's career, in particular, serve as a case study for analyzing these questions?

Counting the Days

The Licensing Act of 1737 secured monopoly status to Covent Garden and Drury Lane, the only theatres where staged plays could be acted 'for hire Gain or Reward' until the introduction of Letters Patent in 1766. It also introduced strict measures by which the Lord Chamberlain's Office would exercise its control over plays and entertainments. Clauses III and IV of the Act made it clear that theatre managers were required to send 'a true Copy' of new or amended plays and entertainments 'fourteen days at least before the acting representing or performing thereof', and ascribed absolute authority to the Lord Chamberlain's judgments:

It shall and may be lawful to and for the said Lord Chamberlain...to prohibit the acting performing or representing any interlude tragedy comedy opera play farce or other entertainment of the stage or any act scene or part thereof or any prologue or epilogue. And in case any person or persons shall for hire, gain or reward act, perform or represent, or cause to be acted, performed or represented...contrary to such prohibition as aforesaid; every person so offending shall for every such offence forfeit the sum of fifty pounds and every grant, license and authority...shall cease, determine and become absolutely void to all intents and purposes whatsoever.⁸

Within this context, direct engagement with contemporary politics would be so strictly monitored by the Lord Chamberlain as to effectively prohibit it. As spaces frequented by men and women from all walks of life, Covent Garden and Drury Lane nevertheless provided important platforms for the dissemination of political values – and indeed, news. Topical addresses were often delivered from the stage, and proved a valuable means by which to celebrate the latest naval or military victory.

Indeed, a number of pivotal battles, such as Talavera and Salamanca, were successfully re-staged during the Napoleonic War Years, resulting in a form of entertainment for which the minor theatres were especially adept.⁹ The bloody and climactic conclusion to the Hundred Days emblemized by the Battle of Waterloo proved relatively resistant to representation, however. Playbills advertising the Royal Circus production of *Richard III* promised that Richmond would appear ‘in a REAL FRENCH CUIRASS, Stripped from a Cuirassier, on the Field of Battle, at Waterloo’; but, for the most part, as Philip Shaw has argued, Waterloo was not and could not be reduced to ‘the status of a historical object’.¹⁰ Indeed, what had seemed to be Napoleon’s final defeat would be only his first abdication. None of the men and women living through this turbulent period of history could, of course, have predicted when the Hundred Days would start, how long it would last, or, in other words, when they would be called upon to pay again the ‘tax of quick alarm’ which so painfully punctures the conclusion to Jane Austen’s *Persuasion* (1818).¹¹ For the political correspondent and theatrical enthusiast Henry Crabb Robinson, Napoleon’s first abdication had been almost beyond the realm of reason; news delivered ‘as by the stroke of an enchanter’s wand’.¹² A year later when, as if by another seeming sleight of hand, Napoleon returned to France, Robinson observed: ‘the prospect is tremendous, if we are to have war; for how are our resources to ensure, which seem now nearly exhausted?’¹³ Beginnings and

endings come together uncomfortably, the prospect of a new war here weighed down by Robinson's apprehension that the allies were already at breaking point.

The theatres had celebrated the peace of 1814 in style. In keeping with larger metropolitan responses, Covent Garden and Drury Lane had been brightly illuminated in commemoration of the allied victory.¹⁴ The streets of London soon thronged with curious onlookers keen to catch a glimpse of the diplomatic celebrities in the capital that summer, such as Alexander I, King William of Prussia, Blücher, Prince Metternich and Prince Leopold. (Wellington would make his victorious entry into London on 28 June 1814.) In order to more prominently advertise its new 'allegorical festival', *The Grand Alliance*, which premiered on 13 June 1814, Covent Garden boasted that a number of the 'illustrious visitors' for which the entertainment had been written would, in fact, be attending the theatre in the company of the Prince Regent. The theatre's actor-manager, John Philip Kemble, and his sister, Sarah Siddons, both enjoyed good relations with the Prince Regent's circle; which goes some way towards explaining the royal sovereigns' return to Covent Garden a few days later on 17 June 1814, and Count Platoff and Blücher's selection of the entertainments staged on 21 June and 22 June respectively.¹⁵ Not to be outdone, Drury Lane, although known as more of a Whiggish theatre, prominently advertised that Alexander I and King William of Prussia would be present on 16 June 1814 to watch Kean perform in Shakespeare's *Othello* and Samuel Arnold's melodrama *The Woodman's Hut*.¹⁶

Heath could not have anticipated that in the summer after Waterloo, Blücher would find himself in the auditorium of Drury Lane, watching Kean first hand. But he would have known – at least by report – that Edmund Kean was an exceptional actor. Following his debut performance as Shylock on 26 January 1814, Kean had taken on a number of other Shakespearean roles, including Richard III, Hamlet, Othello and Iago before concluding his first season at Drury Lane. In the season that followed – already well underway by the start of

the Hundred Days – Kean continued to expand his Shakespearean repertoire (most notably, by playing Macbeth and Richard II). By the end of the Hundred Days, Heath's unlikely trio of 'three great actors' were none other than the men making the greatest headlines.

Kean's career speaks to the politicization of theatre – and, by extension, the theatricalization of politics – during the Hundred Days. The actor's perceived affinity to Napoleon received considerable contemporary endorsement, and was even seemingly reinforced by the actor himself. As has often been remarked, Kean showed a marked preference for playing 'defeated' characters, entailing a re-valorization of men who were often dismissed as comic or grotesque. Kean was not the first to play a sympathetic Shylock (as Peter Thomson and others have pointed out, Charles Macklin preceded him in this respect), but his methodology was original.¹⁷ While contemporary reviewers responded to Kean with varying degrees of enthusiasm, they almost unanimously reflected upon Kean's investment in highly dramatic death scenes, and his ready adoption of gestures and movements more commonly associated with pantomime and melodrama. Defeat, denial and trickery – the three hallmarks of Kean's tragic style – were, of course, shared by Napoleon, as Lord Byron, among others, was quick to recognize.¹⁸

As a member of the Drury Lane Committee, Byron enjoyed privileged access to Kean, both onstage and off.¹⁹ As early as 20 February, he wrote to James Webster, uncertain of Napoleon's fate but confident in the talents of 'a new Actor named Kean':

he is a wonder – & we are yet wise enough to admire him – he is superior to Cooke certainly in many points – & will run Kemble hard – his style is quite new – or rather *renewed* – being that of Nature. - - -'.²⁰

A few weeks after writing this letter, Byron's spirits would receive a blow with news of Napoleon's first abdication. On 9 April 1814, Byron wrote to Thomas Moore describing

Napoleon's fall as a 'crouching catastrophe'.²¹ Eleven days later, he still struggled to contain his feelings of dejection, expounding to Annabella Milbanke:

Buonaparte has fallen – I regret it – & the restoration of the despicable Bourbons – the triumph of tameness over talent – and the utter wreck of a mind which I thought superior even to Fortune – it has utterly confounded and baffled me – and unfolded more than was “dreamt of in my philosophy.”²²

During this period of political and emotional turmoil, Byron would carefully monitor the fortunes of his 'poor little pagod', Napoleon, while admiring the skyrocketing career of Edmund Kean.²³ Byron must thus be seen to posit Kean as, effectively, a rival to Napoleon, but the relationship between the two might also be described as one of surrogacy, as hinted at in Heath's satire.

In 1869 Kean's Victorian biographer Frederick William Hawkins argued that Kean's performances were likely to have influenced Byron's 'Ode to Napoleon' (written in April 1814). As proof, Hawkins argues that key lines in the poem – 'Or trace with thine all idle hand / In loitering mood upon the sand / That Earth is now as free!' – re-mediated the 'expressive action of Kean in drawing figures on the sand with the point of his sword previous to his retirement as Richard III. into his tent'.²⁴ With contemporary audiences accustomed to a staple repertoire in which revivals and adaptations of Shakespeare featured heavily, Kean's ability to ring-fence new interpretative 'points' – i.e. performative climaxes – was crucial to his stage success. His reinvention of 'points', such as this one, was at the heart of his celebrity during the Hundred Days. As Jeffrey Cox explains, points effectively function as 'spots of time in the action when the actor is able to rise above the surrounding plot to perform almost an aria of words and gestures – Macbeth confronted by Banquo's ghost, for example, or Richard III on the battlefield'.²⁵ Hawkins's reading of Byron's 'Ode to Napoleon' reminds us of the metaphorical purchase of 'points' during the Hundred Days

period – a period characterized by actions that seemed to mark the boundaries between the possible and impossible as dangerously porous.

Catch Him if You Can

‘Nothing ever so disappointed me as his abdication’, Byron wrote of Napoleon in 1815, before adding, with relief, that ‘nothing could have reconciled me to him but some such revival as his recent exploit; though no one could anticipate such a complete and brilliant renovation’.²⁶ The unexpectedness of Napoleon’s escape from Elba and return to Paris was read as one of the most abrupt transitions in the French leader’s military career – a transition whose realization and effects were not altogether different from that evinced by Kean on stage. Indeed, Kean was famous for his ability to surprise viewers, moving from one passion to another with impressive speed. In the role of Zanga in Edward Young’s *The Revenge* (1721), Kean’s performance was almost entirely dependent upon ‘abrupt transitions’: ‘His hurried notions had the restlessness of the panther’s; his wily caution, his cruel eye, his quivering visage, his violent gestures, his hollow pauses...were all in character’, the *Examiner* reported.²⁷ It might even be argued that Kean’s attempt to revive *Richard II* in 1815 came short of full success because the title role simply did not deliver enough opportunities for acting of this kind. For Robinson, the play was ‘heavy and uninteresting’, ‘principally because the process by which Richard is deposed is hardly perceived’. It was only in the final two acts, Robinson argued, that Kean really came into his own: ‘In the scene in which he gives up the crown, the conflict of passion is finely kept up. And the blending of opposite emotions is so curious as to resemble incipient insanity’.²⁸ In short, it was only at the play’s conclusion, when the distance between the kingly and the ‘human all too human’

aspects of Richard's selfhood was most extreme, that Robinson recognized Kean's great acting.

But if the breathlessness of Kean's performances captured something of Napoleon's own exceptional return, then it is worth noting that Covent Garden had experienced a homecoming of its own. John Philip Kemble, whose difficult negotiations with the Old Price rioters of 1809 had left him open to accusations of Old Corruption, had sought the earliest opportunity to take a break from the stage, acting again at Covent Garden only on 15 January 1814, after an absence of two years.²⁹ This return was celebrated by *The Times* as late as 1815, when it claimed that 'No man of his day has brought to the stage such qualities, a nobler presence, a more polished taste, a more vigorous, rapid, and imitative seizure of character' than Kemble.³⁰ Kean was inevitably compared to Kemble, who was at once his predecessor and rival to the title of the great tragedian of the age. *The Times*, wearing its conservative politics on its cultural sleeves, thus sides with Kemble, to whom the newspaper ascribes a 'nobler presence' and 'polished taste' – qualities that double as implicit criticism against Kean's putatively less dignified acting. Kean and Kemble approached the representation of passions in markedly different ways. According to the *Theatrical Inquisitor*, 'Mr Kemble exhibits human passions but not as they appear in human beings; he delineates them simply and abstractedly', his more metaphysical response resulting in a seemingly 'unnatural' 'singleness of passion'.³¹ Kean, by contrast, was much more pluralistic in his treatment of the emotions. Like Napoleon, he was perceived to be a man of the people, whereas Kemble was unembarrassedly royalist. Kean and Kemble's differing approaches to their crafts thus became determinedly aligned with disparate political sympathies. There was almost no chance that Kemble's return during the Hundred Days would be confused with Napoleon's – the Duke of Wellington was a more likely model.

The class register that became associated with both Kemble and Kean would have at once figurative and material implications. The theatrical auditorium – although open to royalty, aristocrats, the rising middle-classes and servants alike – was divided according to the price of admission. The boxes constituted the most expensive section; the pit was popular with the middle-classes and critics, due to its close proximity to the stage; while the galleries (both lower and upper) were commonly frequented by apprentices, sailors and servants, since restricted views meant that tickets were cheap at 1 or 2 shillings before half-price. In 1809 Kemble's attempts to increase the costs of admission to the pit and boxes, and to add to the number of private boxes and thus further compromise the views from the galleries at Covent Garden had met with 67 nights of uninterrupted rioting known as the Old Price (O.P.) Riots. It took a hard-fought battle involving numerous arrests and the controversial recruitment of boxers to manage unruly audiences for the O.P. cause to eventually emerge triumphant.³²

Kemble's woes served as an example to the managerial committee of Drury Lane, then working on plans for a new theatre (which opened in 1813 following the original edifice's destruction by fire in 1809). The new Drury Lane's adherence to the familiar model of spectatorship was important to Kean's success, since early reviewers almost unanimously stressed the need to secure a good position from which to see the actor. The still cavernous auditorium of the rebuilt theatre, which made it difficult to hear what was happening on stage (and Kean, in any case, did not have a powerful voice), made it all the more important to observe him as closely as possible (rather than from the distanced galleries of the re-built Covent Garden Theatre). As Iago, for instance, Kean realised a moment of exclusively silent communication with Othello (using his eyes alone for expression) at the play's conclusion. Drury Lane's in-house composer Michael Kelly, enjoyed a privileged perspective from his seat in the orchestra.³³ Byron, who was then a member of the Drury Lane committee, sat beside him on this occasion was thrilled by the intimacy it afforded. He wrote to Thomas

Moore on 8 May 1814: 'Was not Iago perfection? particularly the last look. I was *close* to him (in the orchestra), and never saw an English countenance half so expressive'.³⁴ Robinson, accustomed to sitting in the pit, found himself surprisingly disappointed after acquiring admittance to the boxes. Noting that 'the greater part of the pleasure was lost when the piercing glances from his eyes were lost', Robinson affirmed that he 'never wish[ed] to see or hear Kean from the Boxes'.³⁵ Towards the end of May 1815, when Byron wrote to Leigh Hunt inviting him to watch Kean from the privacy of his own box, he thus underlined the box's closeness to the stage.³⁶ Kean's greatest supporters hailed from the middle classes (who generally preferred the pit) or those with theatrical connections (who could position themselves even closer to the stage).

Yet, as Kean's popularity at Drury Lane acquired a social charge of its own, the Hundred Days theatrical season concluded with threats of another furore at Covent Garden when steeper prices were announced for the theatre's reopening after its summer closure. *The Times* reported that 'a tumultuous clamour commenced' with cries of O.P. soon drowning out James Kenney's farce *Raising the Wind* (1803): 'Hisses, groans, whistling, screaming *O.P.*'s and *Off*'s, were the only sounds that could be heard'. It was further observed that most of this noise came from the pit and that, otherwise, the opponents to the new prices seem to have been 'a visible minority'.³⁷ In 1815, Covent Garden was still haunted by the 1809 riots, while Drury Lane successfully launched an actor whose brilliance largely depended upon the privileged viewing experience associated with the sections of the auditorium that had been rendered most vulnerable by Kemble's proposed reforms.

The Art of Dying

Napoleon's blaze of success at the start of the Hundred Days must have seemed nothing short of necromancy – to both his supporters, such as Byron, who reveled in the leader's unexpected display of power, and his detractors, such as Robinson, who deemed the latest intelligence 'dreadful indeed'.³⁸ In April 1814, Napoleon's first abdication had been interpreted as his death knell. The satiric broadside *The last dying speech, confession and general character of Napoleon* [sic] *Buonaparte* (1814) offers a prime example of this. It features a generic (indeed, excessively outdated) woodcut of a public execution, followed by what purports to be a full criminal confession.³⁹ This imagined confession develops into a chilling catalogue of Napoleon's reported crimes. It begins in the first person, with Napoleon defining himself through his most notorious acts, both general and specific: 'Destroyer of Crowns, and manufacturer of Counts, Dukes, Princes and Kings...Head butcher of the Massacre at Madrid, and the murderer of the noble Duke of Enghien. Kidnapper of a thousand Ambassadors. High Admiral of the threatened Invasion of England....Sanguinary Coxcomb, Assassin, and Incendiary'. This is followed by a brief switch to third person narration, which confirms Napoleon's execution but ultimately claims to give the final say to the French Emperor, whose final words are recorded as the pitifully solipsistic "Alas! alas! poor me!".⁴⁰

Napoleon was, of course, exiled to Elba, rather than executed. Furthermore, even if a lethal punishment had been pursued, Napoleon's execution would hardly have taken place 'at the new drop, High Street, Birmingham, Monday, 11th. April, 1814' as advertised. Thus, while the broadside deliberately engages with the local and familiar spectacle of capital punishment, it never foregoes the fictionality ushered by its proudly provincial character. Mock execution broadsides like this one enjoyed widespread popularity. Earlier examples include *The last dying speech and confession of Neapoleon* [sic] *Bonaparte alias Bonyparty*, which had appeared in Newcastle in 1810, and the 1793 broadside, *The End of Pain* (which

took similar liberties with the exiled Thomas Paine by appropriating T. Ovenden's satirical print, also published in 1793).⁴¹ What makes the Birmingham example especially interesting is the choice of 11 April for its title; that is, the date of Napoleon's exile to Elba. The broadside's viewers were fully cognizant that Napoleon would not die in Birmingham, but this fact mattered less than the invitation to imagine that he might. As Vic Gatrell writes, 'execution sheets were totemic artefacts. They were symbolic substitutes for the experiences signified or the experiences watched'.⁴² This satiric example was no exception.

The possible also eclipsed the probable in Kean's on stage death scenes. The American actor James Henry Hackett, who aimed to offer an exact imitation of Kean's impersonation of Richard III, provides a detailed description of Kean's interpretation of the role in his notes to Oxberry's edition of *Richard III* (1822).⁴³ Punctuated with dramatic dashes symbolic of Kean's celebrated transitions, Hackett's pronounced use of the present participle speaks to Kean's dynamic energy on stage. In the final scene,

[He] fights furiously back & forth – in turning loses [sic] balance, falls on his knee, & fights up, – in turning ^{receives} Richmonds [sic] thrust – lunges at him feebly after it – [clenching] is shoved from him – staggers – drops the sword – grasps blindly at him – staggering backward & falls – head to R.H. – turns upon right side – writhes ^{rests on his} ^{hands} – gnashes his teeth at him (L.H.) as he utters his last words – blinks – & expires, ~~by falling~~ ^{rolling} on his back.⁴⁴

To William Hazlitt, Kean seemed to fight 'like one drunk with wounds'. His refusal to accept defeat was uppermost: 'the attitude in which he stands with his hands stretched out, after his sword is taken from him, had a preternatural and terrific grandeur; as if his will could not be disarmed, and the very phantoms of his despair had a withering power'.⁴⁵ Kean's

interpretation of Macbeth's final moments was similarly pointed: 'In *Macbeth* when mortally wounded he poises himself for a second totters and falls. He revives crawls after his sword and as his fingers reach it he dyes', Robinson wrote in his diary.⁴⁶ There was, then, a clear resemblance between Kean's interpretation of this death scene and his performance as Richard III where, once his sword had been 'beaten out of his hands he continues fighting with his fist as if he had a sword'. The similarity prompted Robinson to reflect that 'even in the last moments the ruling passion and the personalities of the character are not to be lost in the general idea of human suffering'.⁴⁷ Such sensitivity was a hallmark of Kean's acting, which although less 'abstract' than Kemble's, was studied all the same. As G.H. Lewes observed, Kean seemed to evince an acute awareness of the ways in which 'a strong emotion, after discharging itself in one massive current, continues for a time expressing itself in feebler currents'. Thus, 'in watching Kean's quivering muscles and altered tones you felt the subsidence of passion', he argued.⁴⁸ There was a considered, deeply felt and unrelenting energy to Kean's actions.

Upon further reflection Robinson wondered whether Kean's performance of Richard III's final moments would not have been better suited to *Macbeth*. But he recognized that Richard had been performed first and that in the fickle world of celebrity, the actor 'could not afford to reserve his best conception for the fitter occasion'.⁴⁹ He was also conscious that Kean's tragic death scenes had already begun to establish a legacy of their own. Eliza O'Neill – Covent Garden's newest sensation and most serious challenger to Sarah Siddons's fame – showed clear signs of Kean's influence when performing her final scenes in *Isabella*. Robinson observed: 'Her last motions were a convulsive movement of her hands as if in search of her child after she had lost her sight in the agonies of death. This trick she has learnt from Kean'. He adds, moreover, that 'now the idea is known it will become the common property of the profession'.⁵⁰ If, as Robinson claims, previous generations of actors had

focused on the bodily, rather than mental, sufferings associated with death, then audiences during the Hundred Days were privy to death scenes staged with greater emotional awareness than ever before. Kean was arguably the most impressive practitioner of this art, whose aptitude was evinced in his Shakespearean but also, lesser canonical, roles, such as that of Sir Edward Mortimer in George Colman the Younger's *The Iron Chest* (1796; revived at Drury Lane in 1816). In this play, 'the last scene of all' was, for Hazlitt, the most remarkable: 'one of those consummations of the art, which those who have seen and have not felt them in this actor, may be assured that they have never seen or felt any thing in the course of their lives, and never will to the end of them'. The play showcased 'his coming to life again after his swooning at the fatal discovery of his guilt, and then falling back after a ghastly struggle, like a man waked from the tomb'.⁵¹ With Kean's new inflections taken up by O'Neill and other actors, the tragic climax was experienced, during the Hundred Days, in new, more emotive and symbolically drawn-out forms. Kean's lingering moments could be read, by men such as Byron, as an analogue for Napoleon's refusal to relinquish his authority and quit the political stage – while for others, more attuned to Robinson's political sentiments, the same scenes could be read as a rejection of Napoleon's return.

The Blow-up

The Battle of Waterloo was not directly represented on the London patent stages, for reasons both pragmatic and ideological.⁵² As Jeffrey Cox explains, the Licensor's tendency to ban all contemporary history from the stage meant that Waterloo-themed plays were thus avoided at the end of the Hundred Days. The only notable exceptions, he observes, were pantomimes.⁵³ Bringing together song, spectacle and dance, pantomimes were difficult to pin down and could therefore evade censorship more easily. In his essays on pantomime for the *Examiner*

of 1817, Leigh Hunt described pantomime as the perfect vehicle for satire.⁵⁴ It was a genre with which Kean was acutely familiar. His career had begun in the provinces, where he played a diverse repertoire of high and low figures. In his *Reminiscences* Michael Kelly retells the now well-known anecdote that when Samuel Arnold first went to Dorchester to assess Kean's reputed talents, he recognized that as Harlequin, Kean had no competitor.⁵⁵ In fact, prior to his engagement at Drury Lane, Kean had accepted an offer from Robert Elliston, the manager of the Olympic Theatre, who had hired him as the company's principal Harlequin and superintendent in the arrangement of pantomimes.⁵⁶ This was never fulfilled, since successful negotiations were made at Drury Lane instead, but Kean's experiences as a pantomimic actor stood him in good stead at the patent theatres. Although he did not play Harlequin there, he brought the gestural repertoire associated with that role to his performance of tragic figures. Kean's innovative death scenes were, after all, visually expressive above anything else. 'The three great pleasures of pantomime', Hunt numbered, are 'its bustle, its variety, and it's [*sic*] sudden changes' – three great pleasures also associated with Kean's acting.⁵⁷ Thus, even though Robinson struggled to reconcile himself to Kean's 'want of dignity', he could not help but appreciate the actor's 'fine pantomimic face and great agility'.⁵⁸

Such agility was well suited to the contemporary repertoire. As Peter Thomson notes, 'Kean's arrival in London coincided with the flowering of melodrama as the dramatic mode most accommodating to the taste of the time'.⁵⁹ And melodrama, as Cox explains, 'is built for speed'.⁶⁰ Melodrama thus complemented Kean's transition-based acting, but it was also a genre that posed a threat to Kean's success as the leading tragedian of the day. During the Hundred Days period, both patent theatres depended heavily on melodrama. On 27 March 1815, Covent Garden, unable to compete directly with Kean's stage presence, launched Isaac Pocock's new melodramatic entertainment, *Zembuca; or, The Net-Maker and His Wife*.⁶¹ The

play proved so successful that it was performed a further 27 times that season until its final representation on 12 June 1815, a bare week before the Battle of Waterloo.

Pocock's melodrama evolves around the machinations of the Sultan of Persia, the eponymous Zembuca, who has imprisoned Almazaide, the loyal wife of his general, Selim. The latter is banished, a death warrant issued against anyone harbouring him, and a generous reward promised for his denouncer. Thus persecuted, Selim seeks shelter in the cottage of Mirza, the humble net-maker whose name significantly features in the play's subtitle. With Mirza's support, Selim succeeds in returning to the palace under an assumed disguise. But his interview with Almazaide results in his capture; he is made a prisoner and condemned to death. Korac, a slave in whom Zembuca confides, forms an alliance with Mirza in order to release Selim from his captivity. They join a body of troops in open resurrection against Zembuca. The palace is successfully stormed and, in a final act that seeks to restore the balance of justice, the fortress is blown-up.

Contemporary reviewers generally agreed that there was little in the play's plot or dialogue to commend it. The *Morning Post* affirmed that the principal character of Zembuca, 'like most stage tyrants, is somewhat at odds with common sense'.⁶² *The Times*, extending its diagnosis of the weaknesses of melodramas, in general, to Pocock's new play, in particular, claimed that the plot was of 'feeble and incongruous structure';⁶³ while the reviewer for the *Theatrical Inquisitor*, fatigued by the effort of delivering a full plot summary, described the melodrama as a 'mass of absurdities' which did not merit 'more minute detail'.⁶⁴ But was *Zembuca* really nothing more than a 'wretched piece of vamped-up folly', as the *Theatrical Inquisitor* insisted? The patrons of Covent Garden seem to have thought otherwise – or, at least, to have been open to the play's supposedly meretricious quality. For all their reservations, none of the play's critics could overrule its spectacular stage effects: 'the haram scene, with its internal blaze and gorgeous decoration coming in sudden contrast with the

cool and dewy beauty of the moonlight landscape, excited considerable applause', *The Times* attested.⁶⁵ *The Morning Post*, more generous in its praises, suggested that 'the voluptuous splendor of the East has never been more felicitously pictured than by the artists employed on some of the scenes in "Zembuca"''.⁶⁶

[Insert Fig. 2 here]

Fig. 2: Set design by John Henderson Grieve for *Zembuca; or, The Net-Maker and His Wife*, Covent Garden, 1815. Given by John Walford Grieve. Museum number: S.1014-1984 © Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

Pocock's melodrama was also ripe for political application; its representation of the tyrannical Zembuca amenable to re-casting as either Napoleon or one of the restored Bourbon kings, and its theme of slavery serving as a sharp reminder that an European agreement to the abolition of the slave trade had yet to be successfully negotiated.⁶⁷ Indeed, *Zembuca's* concluding scene seemed to openly acknowledge the excessive ways in which its action might be interpreted. The play ends climatically, with a direct denunciation of the Sultan's treachery and the spectacular destruction of his supposedly impregnable fortress. The net-maker Mirza (played by John Emery) and his wife Ebra (played by Maria Gibbs) both assumed pivotal roles:

As ZEMBUCA's party are driven by SELIM's, and followed into the Castle, the Walls appear damaged – Shells and Bombs, &c. seen to pass to and from the Fortress; the Moat appears to fill with water, and the distant part of the Building in flames. The Combatants appear a second time in front – KORAC combats with ZEMBUCA; – his Sword, knock'd from his gripe [sic], is caught up by EBRA, who comes from the steps – the combat is renewed, ZEMBUCA rushes through the portal, followed by

*KORAC....The Building blows up, the Tower falls, and ZEMBUCA, clinging to a rafter is precipitated into the Moat – SEMLIM enters with ALMAZAIDE, MIRZA preceding, and followed by KORAC, all bend the knee to ALMAZAIDE and SELIM – General shout of the Victors. The End.*⁶⁸

The Times may have sardonically concluded that ‘amid the roar of combat and the sweep of flame the curtain comes a welcome intervention to the raptures and fatigues of the drama’,⁶⁹ but there is no denying that this sensational moment of theatre constituted *Zembuca*’s main attraction. As Jane Moody puts it, such ‘conflagrations offer visible image[s] of the moral clarity which melodrama often attempts to impose upon the world’.⁷⁰ Drury Lane itself could not resist the seductive appeal of this. Preferring romance to history, its production of *Charles the Bold; or, The Siege of Nantz* (1815) – an adaptation of René-Charles Guilbert de Pixérécourt’s *Charles le Téméraire: ou le siege de Nancy* – concluded not with Charles ‘slain and stript in vulgar battle with a brother duke’, but ‘blown to pieces by the delicate hand of the fair and heroic *Leontina*’ (played by Frances Maria Kelly).⁷¹ Such ‘moral clarity’ was in high demand, but not to be trusted at face value. As Jane Moody explains, such reassuring simplicity could also prove ‘illusory...a sham’.⁷²

Political sympathies during the Hundred Days were far from black and white. Towards the start of the Hundred Days, Robinson had begun a series of exigent political reflections. In his diary, he noted how he and Hazlitt had ‘once felt alike on politics’. At the time of writing, their ‘hopes and fears’ seemed, however, ‘directly opposed’. Robinson recognized that this spectrum of emotions was a decidedly unstable one: ‘his [i.e. Hazlitt’s] *hatred* and my *fears* predominate and absorb all weaker impressions. This I believe to be the great difference

between us', he concluded'.⁷³ By the end of the Hundred Days, when in the company of William Godwin and the Taylors, Robinson found himself cornered into a decidedly uncomfortable reckoning of past and present political sympathies:

Godwin and I all but quarrelled; both were a little angry, and equally offensive to each other. Godwin was quite impassioned in asserting his hope that Buonaparte may be successful in the war... We, however, agreed in apprehending that Buonaparte may destroy the rising liberties on the French, and that the allies may attempt to force the old Bourbon despotism of the French. But Godwin thinks the latter, and I the former, to be the greater calamity...⁷⁴

What defined the Hundred Days first and foremost was an acute sense of uncertainty. The full duration of the Hundred Days was still unknown to Robinson, even on 23 June 1815 when he described Waterloo as 'most glorious', but remained fearful that 'it will not so affect the French people as to occasion a material defalcation from Buonaparte'.⁷⁵ Mary Favret describes the period as 'cataclysmic', dominated by 'an anxiety that both history and future could be obliterated, and time left drifting in the nearly present (but never present enough) wartime.' 'On the one hand, living "in the meantime" of war means living in constant anticipation and dread; simultaneously, and on the other hand, it means living belatedly', she explains.⁷⁶ In apparent exemplification of this, the *Examiner* reported on 9 April 1815: 'There has been little news of importance during the past week, but then that very fact is important, and tends to shew what doubts and difficulties are daily starting up with regard to the contest against BONAPARTE.'

In the form of melodramas such as *Zembuca*, the patent stages offered visually impressive narratives that sought to provide an antidote to such 'doubts and difficulties'. The genre, which had first emerged after the short-lived Peace of Amiens – another false start for triumphalist myth-making – testified to the ardent emotions experienced during the Hundred

Days. What it lacked in literary sophistication it at least partly made up for through its emotive economy. Edmund Kean, meanwhile – the mercurial actor whose heyday coincided with Napoleon’s return to power – sought to ascribe the experience of living through the Hundred Days with the cultural authority reserved for Shakespeare. He succeeded in doing this, ironically, by acting in a style more suited to pantomime and melodrama than tragedy. Moving with the nimble grace of Harlequin, the small actor travelled the breadth of Drury Lane’s deep stage, revising key performative points, and dying scenes most especially. He may not have been an universal success – indeed, for many theatregoers the opportunity to see him at his best, close-up, would prove elusive – but Kean’s ability to replace expectation with surprise struck a chord, nevertheless.

As an actor Kean was, by definition, a surrogate. The parallels between Kean and Napoleon were relished by Byron, and perhaps even exploited by the actor himself. But all this was secondary to the fact that Kean and Napoleon shared the ability to ensure that when they were on their respective stages, it was the here and now of the dramatic moment that took precedence. Theatre-going, always has the potential of being more than *just* a pastime, but when Napoleon escaped Elba, it provided audiences of all political stripes with a means of conquering the slow and uncertain passage of the Hundred Days.

¹ In her introduction to the British Theatre edition of *Richard III* Elizabeth Inchbald noted that Garrick was particularly well suited to the part because of his height and skills in mimicry. Kean shared similar attributes. *King Richard III: A Tragedy, in Five Acts, by William Shakespeare as Performed at the Theatres Royal, Drury Lane and Covent Garden. Printed under the Authority of the Managers, from the Prompt Book. With Remarks by Elizabeth Inchbald* (London, 1808), 4.

² Anon., *Patriotic Vision appearing to N. Buonaparte* (1808). Broadside. BM Satires undescribed.

³ David Francis Taylor, ‘Harlequin Napoleon: Caricature and the Pantomime of War’. Abstract submitted for *The London Stage and the Nineteenth-Century World* conference, New College, University of Oxford, 14–16 April 2016. See ‘Harlequin Napoleon; Or, What Literature Isn’t’, Chapter 7 of Taylor’s forthcoming book (title tbc) with Yale University Press (2018). I am grateful to David Francis Taylor for introducing me to this print.

⁴ By 30 April 1815 the *Examiner* was already reporting that in their efforts to defeat Napoleon, the Allies had begun to accumulate large armies under Blücher and Wellington.

⁵ Charles Dibdin the Younger, *Memoirs of Charles Dibdin the Younger*, ed. George Speaight (London: Society for Theatre Research, 1956), 119. Dibdin refuses to outline his theories for this perceived shortfall during peacetime.

⁶ Jane Moody, *Illegitimate Theatre in London 1770–1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 102.

⁷ On censorship in this period see L.W. Conolly, *The Censorship of the English Drama, 1737–1824* (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1976).

⁸ ‘The 1737 Licensing Act’, in David Thomas (ed.), *Restoration and Georgian England 1660–1788*, (Cambridge University Press, 1989), 209.

⁹ Elsewhere I argue that battlefields recreated in London’s minor theatres effectively ‘replaced the complex human dimensions of warfare with one of geopolitical order’. For a more detailed discussion of this, see Susan Valladares, *Staging the Peninsular War: English Theatres 1807–1815* (Farnham: Ashgate/Routledge, 2015), Chap. 3.

¹⁰ Playbill for the Royal Circus, 11 September 1815. Philip Shaw, *Waterloo and the Romantic Imagination* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 15.

¹¹ [Jane Austen], *Northanger Abbey: and Persuasion: By the Author of ‘Pride and Prejudice’; ... with a Biographical Notice of the Author. In Four Volumes* (London, 1818), 308; in *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1999). Online.

<http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:ilcs&rft_id=xri:ilcs:ft:ncf:Z000030882:0> [Last Accessed 30.06.17].

¹² Henry Crabb Robinson, *Diary, Reminiscences, And Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson*, selected and edited by Thomas Sadler. 3 vols. (London, 1869), I, 427 (10 April 1814).

¹³ Robinson, *Diary, Reminiscences, And Correspondence*, I, 478 (18 April 1815).

¹⁴ In 1814 celebrations took place across the metropolis – and indeed, Britain. The illuminations were free for all to see. Other forms of jubilee were more exclusive, such as the masquerade held at Burlington House on 1 July 1814.

¹⁵ Siddons officially retired from the stage in 1812 but continued to perform selected roles and deliver private readings.

¹⁶ For a Calendar of Performances spanning the years 1807 to 1815, see Valladares, *Staging the Peninsular War*, Appendices A and B.

¹⁷ See Peter Thomson, ‘Actors and Acting’, in *The Cambridge Companion to British Theatre, 1730–1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 5.

¹⁸ See Nicoletta Caputo, ‘Edmund Kean or “the Romantic Actor”’, in *The Languages of Performance in British Romanticism*, edited by Lilla Maria Crisafulli and Cecilia Pietropoli. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2008; 127–40.

¹⁹ See Byron’s letter to Lady Melbourne, dated 17 Oct 1814, where the poet notes: ‘Dined with Kean (*the Kean*). Kean is a wonderful compound – & excels in humour & mimicry – the last talent is rather dangerous – but one cannot help being amused with it: – in other respects – in private society – he appears diffident & of good address – on the stage he is all perfect in my eyes. –’. *Byron’s Letters and Journals*, edited by Leslie A. Marchand, 12 vols, Vol. IV: ‘Wedlock’s the Devil, 1814–1815’, (Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 1974), 212.

²⁰ Byron to James W. Webster, 20 February 1814, in *Byron’s Letters and Journals*, IV, 67.

²¹ Byron to Thomas Moore, 9 April 1814, in *Byron’s Letters and Journals*, IV, 93.

²² Byron to Annabella Milbanke, 20 April 1814, in *Byron’s Letters and Journals*, IV, 101.

²³ For Byron’s description of Napoleon as his ‘little pagod’, see Byron to Lady Melbourne, 8 April 1814; and Byron to Thomas Moore, 9 April 1814, in *Byron’s Letters and Journals*, IV, 90 and 93 respectively (93).

²⁴ Frederick William Hawkins, *The Life of Edmund Kean: From Published and Original Sources*. 2 vols. (London, 1869), I, 213.

²⁵ Jeffrey Cox, *Romanticism in the Shadow of War: Literary Culture in the Napoleonic War Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 71–2.

- ²⁶ Byron to Thomas Moore, 27 March 1815, in *Byron's Letters and Journals*, IV, 284–5. Napoleon escaped from Elba on 26 Feb 1815. On 13 March he was declared an outlaw. This declaration marked the beginning of the War of the Seventh Coalition.
- ²⁷ *Examiner*, 28 March 1815.
- ²⁸ Henry Crabb Robinson, *The London Theatre 1811–1866: Selections from the Diary of Henry Crabb Robinson*, edited by Eluned Brown (London: The Society for Theatre Research, 1966), 64 (25 May 1815).
- ²⁹ Peter Thomson, 'Chapter 4: Edmund Kean' in *Garrick, Kemble, Siddons, Kean: Great Shakespeareans*. Volume II, edited by Peter Holland (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2010), 146.
- ³⁰ *The Times*, 17 April 1815.
- ³¹ *The Theatrical Inquisitor, and Monthly Mirror* for May 1815, 383.
- ³² On the Old Price Riots, see Marc Baer, *Theatre and Disorder in Late Georgian London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).
- ³³ Michael Kelly, *Reminiscences of Michael Kelly, of the King's Theatre, and Theatre Royal Drury Lane, including a period of nearly half a century; with original anecdotes of many distinguished persons, political, literary, and musical* 2 vols. (London, 1826), II, 284.
- ³⁴ Byron to Thomas Moore, 8 May 1814, in *Byron's Letters and Journals*, IV, 115.
- ³⁵ Robinson, *London Theatre*, 57 (10 May 1814).
- ³⁶ Byron to Leigh Hunt, May – 1 June 1815, in *Byron's Letters and Journals*, IV, 294.
- ³⁷ *The Times*, 21 July 1815.
- ³⁸ Robinson, *Diary, Reminiscences, And Correspondence* (14 March 1815), I, 475. See, also, the *Examiner* for Saturday 26 Mar 1815, wherein it was claimed that 'the whole business [i.e. of the Hundred Days], from its suddenness, looks more like a dream and a vision, than a waking truth...'; and the *Examiner* for Sunday 2 July 1815, which argued 'the changes that now take place in the world have more the look of pageants or shews than any thing else'.
- ³⁹ The appearance of the men gathered to witness the execution suggests Puritan spectators and thus invites associations with the Civil War period – associations that disturb the otherwise straightforward demonization of Napoleon realized by the printed confession.
- ⁴⁰ *The last dying speech, confession and general character of Napoleon* [sic] *Buonaparte*. Printed by H. Wadsworth [11 April 1814]. BM Satires Unnumbered.
- ⁴¹ See *The last dying speech and confession of Neapoleon* [sic] *Bonaparte alias Bonyparty* (1810), BM Satires undescribed; and *The End of Pain* (1793) BM Satires 8294.A. See also T. Ovenden, [*The End of Pain*] (1793), BM Satires 8294.
- ⁴² Vic Gatrell, *The Hanging Tree: Execution and the English People, 1770–1868* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 175.
- ⁴³ Although Hackett's annotations refer to Kean's later acting, as Peter Thomson argues, '...there is good reason to accept that, once he had established himself in a character, Kean aimed to reproduce, not to vary, his performance of it'. Peter Thomson, 'Chapter 4: Edmund Kean', 157.
- ⁴⁴ *King Richard III: Edmund Kean's Performance as recorded by James H. Hackett*, edited by Alan S. Downer (London: The Society for Theatre Research, 1959), 98.
- ⁴⁵ William Hazlitt, *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, edited by P.P. Howe, after the edition of A.R. Waller and Arnold Glover. 21 vols (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, Ltd, 1930–1934). Volume V, 'Lectures on the English Poets and A View of the English Stage'. V, 182.
- ⁴⁶ Robinson, *London Theatre*, 60 (23 December 1814).
- ⁴⁷ Robinson, *London Theatre*, 60 (23 December 1814).
- ⁴⁸ G. H. Lewes, *On Actors and the Art of Acting*. (London, 1875) Second edition. 8–9.
- ⁴⁹ Robinson, *London Theatre*, 60 (23 December 1814).
- ⁵⁰ Robinson, *London Theatre*, 60 (23 December 1814).
- ⁵¹ Hazlitt, *The Complete Works*, V, 344–5.
- ⁵² Frederick Burwick notes that one of the first theatrical representations of the Battle of Waterloo was performed at the old Royalty in Wellclose Square on 15 Nov 1815. Frederick Burwick, '18 June 1815: The Battle of Waterloo and the Literary Response', *BRANCH: Britain, Representation and Nineteenth-Century History*, edited by Dino Franco Felluga. An extension of *Romanticism and*

Victorianism on the Net. Web. [Last accessed: 24 May 2016].

⁵³ Cox, *Romanticism in the Shadow of War*, 166. See also: Jeffrey Cox, ““Illegitimate” Pantomime in the “Legitimate” Theater: Context as Text”, in *Studies in Romanticism* 54 (Summer 2015); 159–186.

⁵⁴ *Theatrical Examiner*, 26 January 1817.

⁵⁵ Kelly, *Reminiscences*, II, 283.

⁵⁶ Kelly, *Reminiscences*, II, 283.

⁵⁷ *Theatrical Examiner*, 26 January 1817.

⁵⁸ Robinson, *London Theatre*, 56 (7 March 1814).

⁵⁹ Thomson, ‘Chapter 4: Edmund Kean’, 173.

⁶⁰ Cox, *Romanticism in the Shadow of War*, 51.

⁶¹ The application for a license for *Zembuca; or, The Net-Maker and His Wife* – listed as a ‘melodramatic romance’ in two acts’ – was submitted by John Fawcett on 11 Mar 1815. The MS was dated by Larpent on 13 March. Dougald MacMillan records ‘slight differences’ between the MS and printed copies. See *Catalogue of the Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library*, compiled by Dougald MacMillan (San Marino, California: San Pasqual Press, 1939), 307 (Entry 1854).

⁶² *Morning Post*, 28 March 1815.

⁶³ *The Times*, 28 March 1815.

⁶⁴ *Theatrical Inquisitor*, March 1815, p. 233.

⁶⁵ *The Times*, 28 March 1815.

⁶⁶ *Morning Post*, 28 March 1815.

⁶⁷ On the issue of slavery during the Hundred Days see, for example, Robinson, *Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence*, I, 440 (29 August 1814).

⁶⁸ Isaac Pocock, *Zembuca; or, The Net-Maker and His Wife. A Dramatic Romance in Two Acts as represented at the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden on Monday, March 27, 1815* (London, 1815), 50.

⁶⁹ *The Times*, 28 March 1815.

⁷⁰ Moody, *Illegitimate Theatre*, 102.

⁷¹ *The Times*, 19 June 1815.

⁷² Moody, *Illegitimate Theatre*, 102.

⁷³ Robinson, *Diary, Reminiscences, And Correspondence*, I, 477 (15 April 1815).

⁷⁴ Robinson, *Diary, Reminiscences, And Correspondence*, I, 489–90 (22 June 1815).

⁷⁵ Robinson, *Diary, Reminiscences, And Correspondence*, I, 491 (23 June 1815).

⁷⁶ Mary Favret, *War at a Distance: Romanticism and the Making of Modern Warfare* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 74.